COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
INDEX
20 June 1967

		Page
ADMINISTRATION		
1.	Dates of Next Meeting	1
2.	Summer Student Program	1
SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS		
1.	General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service	
	a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden	1-2
	b. Geological Survey Hq. Building, Reston, Va.	2
	c. National Zoological Park - Multi-Climate Bldg.	2
	d. National Institutes of Health, Multi-level Parking Facilities, Bethesda, Md.	
	(1) Parking Facilities for Building 31	2
	(2) Parking Facilities for Buildings 37 and 36	2
	e. F.B.I. Building	2-3
	f. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building	3
2.	Federal Reserve Board	
	New Federal Reserve Board Building	3
3.	Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers	
	a. Dalecarlia Filter Plant, Rivers & Harbors Office Building and Shelter over Test Basin	3-4
	b. NCO Open Mess, Ft. Myer	4
	c. Arlington National Cemetery, Administrative and Services Building	4
	d. Dalecarlia Filter Plant Entranceway	4
4.	Department of the Interior, National Park Service	
	a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains	4
	b. National Sculpture Garden	5

c. Douglas Community Center Building 5

d. Dolumbia Island Landscaping Development 5

e. Lincoln Park Reconstruction 5

5. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs 5

6. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

South Leg Inner Loop 6

7. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Dunbar High School Addition 6

b. Congress Heights Elementary School Replacement 6-7

c. Sanitation Department Garage 7

d. New Elementary School, Lincoln Rd. & Douglas Place 7

8. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) American Institute of Architects Headquarters Bldg. 7

(2) Appendix 1 7

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown University Heating and Cooling Plant 8

(2) Appendix 2 8

9. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

Tenth Street, S.W. Overlook Park 8

10. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Pennsylvania Avenue Tree Planting Plan 8

11. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

Medal Commemorating the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of San Antonio 8

12. National Capital Planning Commission

Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Cap. Region 9

13. American Battle Monuments Commission

Selection of Architect for Small Monuments Around the World 9

LEGISLATION 9-10

INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc

a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden 10

b. Geological Survey Headquarters Bldg, Reston, Va. 10

c. Connection between Executive Office Building and the White House 10

2. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

National Sculptural Garden 11

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 20 June 1967. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald B. Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor
NCPC: Richard Huff
Recorder: Eleanor Koontz

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting

Tuesday-Wednesday, 19-20 September 1967 were approved.

2. Summer Student Program

The Secretary introduced Constance Werner, Daniel Reiff and William Gwin, college students employed to assist in the Georgetown Waterfront Survey sponsored jointly by the Historic American Buildings Survey and the Commission of Fine Arts.

III. SUBMISSIONS and REVIEWS

The Secretary presented and reviewed the following projects.

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room during the discussion of projects a and b.

a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden - designed by Mr. Bunshaft, of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, New York architects, for a site on the Mall along Independence Avenue between 7th and 9th Streets,

N.W. Drawings and study models of the preliminary design, site and building plans were submitted.

b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building, Reston, Va. -

designed by Walter Netsch of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, Chicago and H.D. Nottingham and Associates, architects. A small scale site model, diagrammatic plans and elevations were submitted for review.

An off-the-record review of these projects was held in the adjoining gallery. Detailed explanations by the architects were scheduled for the afternoon session.

c. National Zoological Park - Multi-Climate Building - designed by Alan Jacobs and William Metcalf, architects.

The master plan with new buildings indicated schematically was approved during the January meeting. Present submission consisted of detailed sketches of the multi-climate building. The site and design followed closely guidelines previously established - the building was essentially buried in the hillside.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects the following day.

d. National Institutes of Health, Multi-Level Parking Facilities, Bethesda, Md.

(1) Parking Facilities for Building 31 designed by Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon and Carroll, Grisdale and Van Alen, architects.

(2) Parking Facilities for Buildings 36 and 37 designed by Smith, Hinchman and Grylls, Associates, Inc., architects. A small site model and building model were submitted with drawings.

The sites for the above structures conformed to the previously approved master plan. Placing the structures in natural depressions minimized the visibility of them from major roadways, a feature the Commission recommended be further reinforced by the addition of screen trees adjoining all sides of the buildings.

The Commission thought both structures were well designed and agreed to approve them with the foregoing provision.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects the following day.

e. F.B.I. Building - Revised Design by C.F. Murphy and Associates,

Beiswenger, Hoch, Arnold and Associates, architects, for a site at 9th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

During the April meeting the Commission had requested that the base be restudied and suggested that the wall be recessed to the rear face of the columns. However, the changes to details and proportions of the base were unsatisfactory in the members opinion. The upturned beams serving as a rail on the second floor deck split the lower two bays nearly in half, and the face of the lower wall had not been recessed with the exception of a thin groove next to the columns and floor slab. This was not what the Commission had recommended - and it was the consensus that the proposed design was unacceptable.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

f. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Designed by John S. Samperton and William Procopiow, architects, for the campus at Florida Avenue and 7th Street, N.W. Drawings of this project were submitted with various phases of the Master Plan developed by Kendall Green and Henry D. Mayfield, Jr., consulting architects for the college.

The Commission thought the master plan required a more thorough 3-dimensional study. The design for the dormitory was also inadequate. A block model of the campus would obviously be necessary for the next submission.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

2. Federal Reserve Board

New Federal Reserve Board Building, C Street between 20th and 21st Streets, N.W. - Revised Design by Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, architects.

During the April meeting the Commission had accepted the proposal that the building be raised one floor and some of the mechanical equipment placed within that area. The revised design included another floor, reduced the angle of the roof penthouse somewhat, but the Commission felt the clumsy appearance of the roof had not been resolved.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Dalecarlia Filter Plant, Rivers and Harbors Office Building, and Shelter over Test Basin - Proposed designs by Justement and Callmer,

architects, for Dalecarlia Reservation, Little Falls Road, N.W. Site plans, floor plans and elevations of both projects, a model of the Office Building (Kingman Building) and a perspective of the shelter were submitted.

The Commission generally considered the buildings to be well designed and in harmony with the other structures.

The members thought that more should be done to screen the parking lot from MacArthur Boulevard and discussed the possibility of terracing the lot with a series of tree lined walls.

The Commission's approval and recommendations were forwarded to the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers EXHIBIT A

b. NCO Open Mess, Ft. Myer - Proposed design by Elkan W. Groll and Associates and Forest Coile and Associates, architects.

The Commission felt the design had been greatly simplified and also tied in with adjoining buildings much better. The only change recommended was to eliminate the canted soffit and substitute a flat overhanging eave to match other nearby structures.

c. Arlington National Cemetery, Administrative and Services Building - Review for purpose of recording the Commission's approval, which was given during the summer recess by mail. The plans were by Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, architects, and Sasaki, Dawson and Demay, landscape architects.

Notice of the Commission's approval is EXHIBIT C.

d. Dalecarlia Filter Plant Entranceway - Review for purpose of recording the Commission's approval, which was given during the summer recess by mail. The plans were by Beech Associates, architects and planning engineers.

Notice of the Commission's approval is EXHIBIT D.

4. Department of Interior, National Park Service

Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room during the discussion of projects a and b.

a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains - designed by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, San Francisco,architects. Drawings submitted indicated retention of the simplicity of the Ellipse Park as previously recommended by the Commission.

b. National Sculpture Garden - designed by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, San Francisco, architects, for the Mall, along Constitution Avenue between 7th and 9th Streets, N.W.

An off-the-record review and discussion of these projects was held in the adjoining gallery and followed projects 1a and 1b above. A detailed explanation by a member of the architectural firm was planned for the following day.

The Commission's approval of the Ellipse Walks and Fountains, 4a above, was forwarded to the Department of Interior, National Park Service.

EXHIBIT E

C. Douglass Community Center Building, 20th Street North of Stanton Terrace, S.E. - designed by Cross and Adreon, architect.

The Commission thought the design was eccentric, too complicated and therefore unacceptable.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architects on the following day.

d. Columbia Island Landscaping Development - designed by Edward D. Stone, Jr., landscape architect.

The Commission recommended that the fountain have a massive flow of water rather than jets as indicated. The members felt a thorough review of the details should be made by Mr. Sasaki before final action is taken.

An interview with the landscape architect was planned for the following day.

e. Lincoln Park Reconstruction (withdrawn)

5. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs by Harry Weese and Associates, architects. Numerous drawings depicting stations and elements of continuity in the design were submitted with a resume.

Four types of stations planned were: cut-and-cover for Judiciary Square; tunneled in rock, Dupont Circle; over head exterior structure with parking lot, Rhode Island Avenue; and remodeling of existing structure, Union Station. These types were said to be based on soil conditions. Elements of continuity were limited escalators and stairs, lighting of systems, platform and treatment of platform edges, symbols and signage, etc.

The Commission felt the drawings indicated a superficial approach to the problem and that a stronger overall concept was necessary at this stage. In general the members were disappointed in the lack of development and the absence of imagination throughout the study.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

6. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic, South Leg Inner Loop -West Mall Tunnel Project, prepared by Palmer, Campbell and Reese, consulting engineers. Drawings of ventilation exhaust structure, west portal, approach tunnel ramps, mounted luminaires, and landscape plans were submitted.

The Commission felt that the proximity of the open section of the freeway to the Lincoln Memorial required more study. Removal of trees and the possible destruction of others, especially where the tunnel would cross underneath the reflecting pool, were strongly questioned. Also the height and location of the massive ventilating towers was scrutinized. More study of all details was necessary.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the engineers on the following day.

7. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Dunbar High School Addition - Revised Design by Walton and Madden, architects, for a site at 1st and N Streets, N.W.

The Commission had recommended that the preliminary design be simplified and the various masses consolidated. Revised according to these recommendations, the new design, which also tied in with the existing school very well, was approved. The Commission requested that the brick match the color and texture of the existing building.

The Commission's approval and suggestion were forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT F

b. Congress Heights Elementary School Replacement - designed by Johannes and Murray, architects, for a site at 6th Street and Alabama Avenue, S.E.

The Commission approved the massing and plan of the scheme but requested that the facade be restudied.

The present design was too fussy and lacked relation to structure, materials, etc.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Department of

Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT G

c. Sanitation Department Garage - Proposed Design by William N. Denton, architect, for a site at 13th and S Streets, N.W. A model and drawings were submitted.

Planned as a two-story building with parking area on the roof, the structure would be brick and perforated block. The Commission considered the design completely inadequate. The architect appeared to have made very little effort.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT H

d. New Elementary School - Proposed Design by Metcalf and Associates, architects, for a site at Lincoln Road and Douglas Place, N.E.

The Commission considered the site fairly good but the design too confusing and poorly organized. A more thorough study of the project was required. The style was also heavily loaded with mannerisms.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Buildings and Grounds. EXHIBIT I

8. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design by Mitchell/Giurgola, Associates, architects. A model and plans were submitted.

Many motifs were incorporated into the revised design. The Commission felt that the simplicity and beauty of the Octagon House and Garden would be overshadowed and that this historic house and its garden must be preserved. Any design for the proposed new structure should serve as a backdrop. The members considered this design out-of-scale and inappropriate to the site. The concensus was clearly one of disapproval.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the architect on the following day.

(2) Appendix 1

The Commission approved the action recommended by the staff on Shipstead-Luce Applications listed on Appendix 1. EXHIBIT J

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown University Heating and Cooling Plant designed by Mariani and Associates, architects. A block model showing contour interval and relationship of proposed facility to site, adjacent park, roadway, etc., was submitted.

The Secretary discussed a letter from the Committee of 100 on the Federal City which questioned the accuracy of the model and stated discrepancies in information furnished to various agencies required to review this project.

The Commission reaffirmed their previous action on this design but requested that all information on this project be thoroughly verified before a building permit is issued.

The Commission's action and request was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections. EXHIBIT K

(2) Appendix 2

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed on Appendix 2. EXHIBIT L

9. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

10th Street, S.W. Overlook Park - Revised Design (withdrawn)

10. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Pennsylvania Avenue Tree Planting Plan designed by Dan Kiley for the section between 9th and 12th Streets, N.W. A model and several drawings were submitted.

The Commission approved the plan for two rows of linden trees on the north side of the Avenue and the retention of the existing single row of red oaks on the south.

The Commission's action was reported to the President's Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.

11. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

Medal Commemorating the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of San Antonio - Proposed Design

The Commission approved the design which had been submitted to the Bureau of the Mint by the sponsoring group "International Exposition Hemisfair '68."

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the Bureau of the Mint. EXHIBIT M

12. National Capital Planning Commission

Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Region

The Commission decided to take the 1985 Plan under advisement and would make no formal comment on it at the present time.

13. American Battle Monuments Commission

Selection of Architect for Small Monuments Around the World

The Commission was requested to advise upon the selection of Lorimer Rich, architect, for small monuments at various battlefields around the world. The architectural firm of Sherwood, Mills and Smith, previously approved, preferred a different approach to the problem than the Battle Monuments Commission had planned.

The Commission of Fine Arts recommended that additional architects be considered.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the American Battle Monuments Commission. EXHIBIT N

IV. LEGISLATION

The Secretary presented and discussed the following proposed legislation which is submitted with the Commission's reports, as exhibits.

1. H.R. 9808-5/9/67-Mr. Eilberg-90thC

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia. Disapproved. EXHIBIT O

2. S.J.Res. 74-4/18/67-Mr.Randolph-90thC

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas. Approved. EXHIBIT P

3. S. 1582-4/19/67-Mr. Muskie-90thC

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal Public Buildings and Post Offices outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act. Disapproved. EXHIBIT Q

4. S. 1590-4/20/67-Mr.Yarborough-90thC

To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any

construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future space needs of the Congres. Approved. EXHIBIT R

V. INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Mr. Bunshaft withdrew from the room during the discussion of projects a and b. Mr. L. L. Hunter and other representatives of Public Buildings Service attended the meeting during the discussion of the following.

a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Proposed Design

Mr. Frederick Gans of the New York office of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, gave a detailed explanation of the design. His description and the members' comments, contained in the transcript of the meeting, are submitted for the record. EXHIBIT S[1]

The Commission's views were forwarded to Public Buildings Service. EXHIBIT S[2]

b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building, Reston Virginia. Proposed Design

Mr. Walter Netsch of the Chicago office of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, gave a detailed explanation of the project. His remarks and the members' comments, contained in the transcript of the meeting, are submitted for record. EXHIBIT T[1]

The members continued the discussion on the following day. With many reservations, they voted 4 to 2 to approve preliminary scheme.

The Commission's action was forwarded to Public Buildings Service. EXHIBIT T[2]

c. Connection Between Executive Office Building and the White House

Mr. Nicholas Satterlee, architect, discussed the plans which included an entrance from E Street to the lowest level underground loading platform for trucks. Another entrance lead to a temporary motor court (limousine area) which would be placed underground in the future. A terrace was planned for the motor court roof. An addition to the Executive Offices formed the third level. The removal of West Executive Avenue provided a landscaped area which formed the roof to the new addition. A tunnel under Pennsylvania Avenue provided access to the Executive Office Building on the west side of Lafayette Square.

The Commission considered the problem solved. The general scheme which will lead eventually to underground parking for all types of vehicles near the White House was particularly well accepted.

The Commission's action was forwarded to General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service.

2. Department of Interior, National Park Service

a. National Sculptural Garden - Revised Design

Mr. John Woodbridge of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, architects, discussed the project.

The major change in the design was the entranceway on Constitution Avenue which permitted a direct view of the skating rink and also space on either side for rest rooms and guard facilities. The roof formed a bridge which provided a continuity of circulation over the top. A restaurant was planned along the western side. The changes in level formed a continuous path from one feature of the garden to the other. The survival of the great beech tree in the skating rink was doubtful.

The Commission thought the general plan was acceptable, but only with further study of several details, especially the square exhibit areas projecting into the central circular space on the diagonals of the garden. They appeared to interrupt the design rather than fit in.

Mr. Woodbridge indicated agreement on this point and agreed the design would be restudied for final presentation to the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. on the following day.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Watt:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the Rivers and Harbors Office Building at the Dalecarlia Filter Plant during its meeting on June 21st.

The Commission approves the design with the provision that the parking lot be restudied with heavier planting and terracing to lessen its impact and improve the view from MacArthur Boulevard. We suggest that a five foot retaining wall be used between each section of the parking lot. Materials selected for the building and parking lot should be compatible with neighboring structures and material samples should be submitted to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. D. M. Watt, Chief
Washington Aqueduct Division
U. S. Army Engineer District, Baltimore
1st and Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20315

July 13, 1967

Dear Colonel Adams:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the NCO Open Mess at Fort Myer at its June 21st meeting. The Commission recommends restudy of the cornice treatment and elimination of the angular soffit. The materials and roof treatments of this building and those planned for its vicinity should be closely related.

We will be glad to review new studies as they are developed either at our next meeting in September or by mail before the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Colonel C. E. Adams, Jr.
District Engineer
Norfolk District, Corps of Engineers
803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

EXHIBIT B

14 June 1967

Dear Mr. Robin:

The Services Complex, Arlington National Cemetery, has been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. C.J. Robin
Chief, Engineering Division
Norfolk District Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Fort Norfolk, 803 Front Street
Norfolk, Virginia 23510

EXHIBIT C

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Watt:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for a shelter to cover an existing test basin at the Dalecarlia Filter Plant during its meeting on June 21st.

The Commission approves the design as submitted and suggests that it would be more appropriate to use unpainted concrete block with the cement cornice and the Cor-Ten steel proposed.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. D. M. Watt, Chief
Washington Aqueduct Division
U. S. Army Engineer District, Baltimore
1st and Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington D. C. 20315

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

3 August 1967

Dear Mr. Hartzog:

The Commission of Fine Arts approved the most recent plans for the Ellipse at its meeting on June 21st. The essential character of the park as an open setting for the White House is, of course, greatly enhanced by the removal of surface parking, and the small fountains on the east-west axis of the Ellipse and in the corners of the park are unobtrusive and add just the right amount of interest.

We would, of course, like to see details of the fountains when they are developed at a later date.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director
National Park Service
Department of the Interior
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F

July 13, 1967

Dear General Mathe:

The Commission of Fine Arts approved revisions to the design of the Dunbar High School addition at its meeting on June 20th. The new scheme is much stronger in its simplicity and will provide a more workable solution to a fairly complex program.

The old building, as you know, is a typical "Tudor" school design with dark red brick and limestone trim. The same quality of materials should be continued on the new addition.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Robert E. Mathe
Engineer Commissioner
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT F

July 13, 1967

Dear General Mathe:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the Congress Heights School at its June 20th and 21st meeting. The scheme presented seemed direct and geometrically simple, but exhibited little in the way of architectural interest on the facades. We would therefore like to see the architect make some additional studies with this in mind.

New submissions can be made to the Commission at any time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Robert E. Mathe
Engineer Commissioner
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT G

July 13, 1967

Dear General Mathe:

The Commission of Fine Arts disapproved the design for a Sanitation Department Garage for 13th and S Streets, N. W. at its meeting on June 20th.

The presentation indicated that little effort had been made on the project simply because it was merely a garage. This is an attitude that the Commission cannot accept.

To begin with it is easier to develop a good building where the program is basically so simple. Secondly, and more important, there is no place in the District where a second rate effort by the Government can be tolerated. This ought to be made clear to the architects.

The Commission will be glad to review new studies at any time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Robert E. Mathe
Engineer Commissioner
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT H

July 13, 1967

Dear General Mathe:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for an Elementary School at Lincoln Road and Douglas Place, N. E., at its June 20th and 21st meeting. We feel that the design should be restudied.

While the plan seemed to be fairly well organized - in some respects quite unique - the exterior architectural treatment was so manneristic, that it failed to achieve any unity.

The Commission is not scheduled to meet until September. However, we would be glad to mail new sketches to the members at any time in order to facilitate progress.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Brigadier General Robert E. Mathe
Engineer Commissioner
District of Columbia
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS 6/20-21/67

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
108	4229 Colo. Ave., NW N. W. Development	Brick dwelling.
ACTION: Because of limited effect on Rock Creek Park, the CFA waives further review of this project, despite inferior quality of design of both bldgs. & site, 6/16/67.		
109	4231 Colo. Ave., NW	Same as SL 67-108.
110	4235 Colo. Ave., NW	Same as SL 67-108.
111	4239 Colo. Ave., NW	Same as SL 67-108.
112	4243 Colo. Ave., NW	Same as SL 67-108.
115	606-5th St., NW Victory House	1 s-f, 25 sq-ft illuminated sign. Plastic face. Black ltrs. on white background.
ACTION: Disap'd. Internally illuminated plastic-face signs not permitted in S-L area. Recom. individual opaque ltrs. or a simple painted sign with indirect lighting, 6/20/67.		
116	1735 New York Ave., NW American Inst. of Architects	Hqtrs. Bldg. for AIA.
ACTION: Disap'd. See attached ltr. dtd. 7/12/67 to Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 7/12/67.		

EXHIBIT J

APPENDIX I

July 12, 1967

Dear Mr. Green:

After careful consideration the Commission of Fine Arts has disapproved a design for the Headquarters Building of the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, N. W. The overriding consideration of the Commission is the relationship of any new structure to the historic Octagon Building and garden. In this respect we feel the two structures are completely incompatible. The proscenium-like frame rising some 90' high would make the Octagon appear like a toy or a piece of stage furniture, an unsuitable setting for one of the most historic structures in Washington. The proposed building would be far too assertive on this limited site and thus violate the harmony which the Commission feels is the principle precept to be followed in designing new structures for the Capital.

The Commission's reasons for disapproving this project could be expanded and therefore we have indicated to representatives of the Institute of Architects that we will be glad to discuss our action in greater detail and to explore other directions and alternatives.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

JUN 14 1967

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
103	1665 No. Portal Dr., NW United House of Prayer	Chg. exist. outdoor floodlignts & add add'l. floodlights. Light rays to be confined to property lines only.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for add'l. inf. Indicate location of lights, height above ground & type of support, 5/9/67.	
104	2711 Jenifer St., NW Mr & Mrs R. H. Fleming	Detached single-family dwelling.
ACTION:	App'd., 5/9/67.	
105	139 C St., SE Thos. Campbell	Erect 2nd fl. addn. over garage on rear.
ACTION:	App'd., 6/2/67.	
106	425-13th St., NW Abby Restaurant Corp.	2 s-f plastic signs flat against E St. side of bldg. only. 46 sq-ft.
ACTION:	What is difference between this & previous appl. which was disap'd. See action on SL 67-95, 5/25/67.	
107	499 So. Capitol St., SW Marfair Joint Venture	8-story off. bldg. with lst fl. commercial space & 2 basem. levels of parking.
ACTION:	App'd. Request subm. of material samples for review, 6/1/67.	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

JUN 14 1967

NO SL 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
113	1665 No. Portal Dr., NW House of Prayer	Install flood lights on bldg.
ACTION: Inf. still inadequate. Furnish plans showing exactly where these lights are to be located on the site and/or bldg., 6/7/67.		
114	642-17th St., NW Globe Book Shop	1 s-f sign, 25 sq-ft. Exactly like the 4 you app'd. for same location. Colors white with brown faces (opaque).
ACTION: App'd., 6/7/67.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAY 11 1967

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
184	1321-31st St., NW Rep. & Mrs. Wm. Moorhead	2-level addn.--garage on lower level, terrace rm. over--replace part of exist. garden wall & landscaping.

ACTION: No obj. to garden wall or location of garage & terrace rm. addn. Request further study of garage elevation. Brick panel over doorway appears somewhat heavy. Suggest this element be studied in a simple perspective sketch showing proposal from southwest corner of Dumbarton & 31st Sts., 4/27/67.

185 1348-27th St., NW — New dwelling.
Mr & Mrs Stephan Trentman

ACTION: Recom. restudy. Variety of openings excessive on front elevation & do not appear as well related as they should be--the 1st fl. openings especially so. Suggest 1 study treating garage & front entr. with flat lintels & another study with segmental arches. Also suggest raising 2nd fl. windows 12"-15" & reducing width somewhat. A standing seam metal roof is also preferred over slate roof, 4/26/67.

187 3323 Reser. Rd., NW — Install air-cond. water tower on roof.
Louise B. P. Riggs

ACTION: Recom'd. provided air-cond. unit is painted to match roof, 4/27/67.

188 2443 P St., NW — Install garage door & side door, make repairs to garage.
Edward Riggs

ACTION: Recom'd., 4/27/67.

190 3103 M St., NW — 1 canvas awning above showwindows. No fixed iron frames or posts.
Georgetown Lamp Gallery

ACTION: Recom'd. provided valance be omitted & that either solid color or only 2 stripe colors be used. Suggest brick panels beneath showwindows be painted to match rest of bldg., 4/27/67.

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
191	1669-32nd St., NW Stephen Kurzman	Remove roof of porch. Install 6-panel "colonial" type wood door, Morgan. Install 6 shutters. Install muntins, 12 panes/window.

ACTION: Recom'd. provided shutters be omitted, 4/27/67.

192	3149 M St., NW Riggs National Bank	Apply new Mineralite facing to east & north exterior walls of exist. bldg.

ACTION: Recom'd. provided material match exist. limestone as closely as possible, 4/27/67.

193	1208 Wisc. Ave., NW W. T. Weaver & Sons, Inc.	1 d-f, 7 sq-ft projecting wood sign & w. i. supporting bracket & brace over store entr. Off-white, black, green, gold.

ACTION: Resubmit. Suggest bottom of sign be squared off. Request color samples. (Recom. different green), 4/27/67.

195	1237-39 Wisc. Ave., NW Stanton Kolb	Build 1-story addn. to side of exist. bldg. Brick up windows in area walls.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Recom. reduction in height of parapet & metal roof. Suggest carrying through same line & character as on bay window of adjacent bldg., 4/27/67.

197	1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW Tino's Restaurant	Details of 2nd fl. iron works.

ACTION: Recom'd. use of J. G. Braun Co. design #9947 iron for vertical posts & 2 panels in each section of railing. Subm. detail framing plans & sections of roof trellis, 4/28/67.

June 21, 1967

Dear Mr. Green:

At its meeting on June 21, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the most recent application (O. G. 67-211, O. G. 67-189, O. G. 67-82), for the construction of a heating and cooling plant on the campus of Georgetown University.

As stated on at least one previous occasion, the Commission has no objection to the architectural design. The Commission is aware, however, that certain citizens' groups, notably the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, have raised what very well may be legitimate questions on the accuracy of the data submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts. This is especially true of the various grades and elevations in relation to the site, dimensions which would affect the impact this building will have on Glover Archbold Park. There is also some question about the possibility of mechanical equipment projecting above the top of the enclosing screen wall.

We therefore urge that before a building permit be issued to the University, the accuracy of this information be verified. Such action would certainly be in the public interest. The Commission also requests that detailed working drawings be submitted for final review.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT K

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS 6/20-21/67

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
224	3345 M St., NW Spencer Diamond	Addn. to rear of exist. store bldg.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 6/7/67.	
225	1321-35th St., NW Blanche McClellan	Brick fence, approx. 7' high.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for add'l. inf. No obj. to concept, but drawings are inadequate to represent details, 6/15/67.	
226	3027 Dent Pl., NW Delphine Brune	Install air-cond. unit.
ACTION:	No obj., 6/15/67.	
227	2710 "O" St., NW Mr & Mrs Eric Paepcke	Raze exist. 2-story frame dwelling in entirety. Not condemned by D. C. Gov't. Erect new brick dwelling.
ACTION:	No obj. to razing exist. bldg. No obj. to general design of new bldg., provided panel garage door is substituted for proposed. Resubm. drawings, 6/15/67.	
229	1208 Wisc. Ave., NW Weaver Hardward Store	Sample of Benjamin Moore House Paint decorated trim "Park Green". Proposed sign.
ACTION:	No obj., 6/15/67.	
230	1808 Wisc. Ave., NW Germar Properties	1 s-f, 6 sq-ft sign. Wood. Black ltrs. on white bckgd. Over entrance.
ACTION:	No obj., provided a full size ltr. drawing or sample of exact ltr. is submitted, 6/15/67.	

EXHIBIT L

APPENDIX 2

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
231	3404 P St., NW Suzan R. Mackler	Remove 2-story addn. to rear of structure. Add 2-story & basem. addn. to west of bldg.
ACTION: Recom'd., 6/15/67.		
232	3217 Reser. Rd., NW Mr. Patrick Saul	6' & 42" chain-link fence.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Chain-link is not appropriate in Old Georgetown area. Recom. wood fence, 6/20/67.		
233	1644-31st St., NW Armistead Peter, III	Erect new addn.
ACTION: No obj. to garage addn., but recom. restudy, simplification & resubm. of brick fence, 6/15/67.		
234	3700 Reser. Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Reduced size of light globes from 24" to 16" in diameter.
ACTION: Recom'd., 6/20/67.		
211	3800 Reser. Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Heating & Cooling plant model.
ACTION: See attached ltr. dtd. 6/21/67 to Mr. J. P. Green, Ass't. Superintendent of Licenses & Permits, 6/21/67.		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS JUN 13 1967

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
194	3125 "O" St., NW Mr & Mrs R. Evans, Jr.	Glass enclosure.

ACTION: Limited view from public space precludes obj. within intent of P. L. 808, 81st Congress, 6/1/67.

199	3700 Reser. Rd., NW Georgetown U.	Lighting for St. Mary's parking lot.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Lights appear to be oversized & excessive. Suggest a more limited approach, 6/1/67.

203	3022 "O" St., NW Mrs L. K. Barry	Excavate front yard for parking space & install new metal stairs.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Proposed parking area disrupts continuity of sidewalk & streetscape in general, & this row of houses in particular, JUN 13 1967

204	1348-27th St., NW Mr & Mrs S. Trentman	New dwelling, revisd. drawings.

ACTION: Recom'd. develop. of design showing rectangular openings on all flrs. on front elevation, as discussed at meeting with architect on 5/9/67, 6/1/67.

207	1081-83 Thos. Jeff. St., NW W. Starr & V. Gesumaria	Convert exist. bldg. to 2 townhouses.

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study. Question variety of fenestration, location of exterior stairways & garage doors, 5/24/67.

209	1250-37th St., NW Georgetown U.	Library. Material samples.

ACTION: Materials subm'd. to this off., & as specified in ltr. dtd. 5/18/67 from Mr. Charles G. Palmer of John Carl Warnecke & Associates, conform to proposal previously considered & are recom'd., 5/25/67.

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
210	3234 N St., NW J. V. Mladek	12" wood fence to conceal view & noise of Selatest garage.
ACTION: Recom'd., provided that so. elevation of fence is entirely sheathed in wood. No cinder-block to be visible, 5/25/67.		
212	3221 M St., NW Clyde Hyde	New store front.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Elements of facade poorly related & awkward in appearance & scale. Suggest restudy of design, 6/1/67.		
213	1214-28th St., NW Modart Draperies	Supports on roof for air-cond. unit.
ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.		
214	3104 M St., NW Robert Smith	Install new flood & coach lights.
ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.		
215	1250-37th St., NW Georgetown U.	Library
ACTION: Design conforms to subm. previously app'd. by the CFA & is recom'd., 5/25/67.		
216	1800 Wisc. Ave., NW H. G. Gill & Son	Add 2nd-fl. rm. to rear of exist. bldg.
ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.		

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
217	3000 M St., NW Sinclair Refining Co.	New pitched roof to exist. structure, new br. facing, new paving, new landscaping, new exter. lighting, walls, & sign.

ACTION: Ret'd. for clarification. General design OK, but question treatment of west elevation (use of 3 different materials). How is this to be unified? Also question the number & design of lighting fixtures on bldg., 6/1/67.

218	1353-28th St., NW M. C. Shelesnyak	Addn. to exist. bldg.

ACTION: Recom'd. as revised on drawing #2A, showing 3 separate sash on 2nd & 3rd flrs. Recom. either bay window as shown or triple window in face of wall with cornice over opening. Suggest 2nd & 3rd fl. windows have 6/6 lights, 5/24/67.

219	1605-35th St., NW Lt. C. Laurie F. Hess	Set cooler on roof. Make opening in wall.

ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.

220	1605-35th St., NW Lt. C. L. F. Hess	New overhead garage door to replace exist. Widen opening from 8' to 10' & replace exist. wooden beam with steel beam.

ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.

221	1239 Wisc. Ave., NW Wm. R. Winslow	Install 1 10-ton packaged air cond. on rear roof - 1 story.

ACTION: Recom'd., 6/1/67.

222	1208 Wisc. Ave., NW W. T. Weaver & Sons, Inc.	Erect wood sign & w. i. support. bracket over store entr.

ACTION: Orig. obj. withdrawn, although sign is still overdesigned, & a simpler frame is preferred. Request sample of color, 6/1/67.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

JUN 13 1967

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
223	1235-31st St., NW Timothy King	Install air cond. thru wall under front window & new iron rail.

ACTION: Recom'd. provided wrought-iron grill is attached directly to the bldg. & not supported by the a-c unit, 6/1/67.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

MAY 24 1967

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
196	1239 Wisc. Ave., NW Baylor Furniture	Replace front door with colonial door.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/9/67.	
198	1619-30th St., NW Chas. J. Lanks	Enlarge 4 exist. windows for add'l. light & ventil. as per D. C. Housing Div. Requirements.
ACTION:	Recom's., 5/9/67.	
200	2726 "O" St., NW Gen. Scanlon	Remove exist. air-cond. unit & install new furnace, air-cond. unit.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 5/9/67.	
201	1237-39 Wisc. Ave., NW Stanton Kolb	Build 1-story addn. to side & rear of exist. bldg. Brick-up windows in area walls. New showwindow to carry thru same line & character as on bay window of adjacent bldg.
ACTION:	Recom'd., as revised, 5/9/67.	
202	3345 M St., NW Estelle & Spencer Diamond	New addn. to exist. bldg.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for further study of east elevation, 5/9/67.	
205	1353-28th St., NW M. C. Shelesnyak	Remove rear walls opening into addn., & erect 2-story & basem. addn. on rear.
ACTION:	Ret'd. for add'l. study of fenestration. Recom. against triple window, 5/9/67.	

NO OG 67-	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
206	2524 Q St., NW Russell A. Eldridge	Revision of app'd. plan to relocate garage, & erect steps beyond bldg. line.

ACTION: Recom'd., 5/9/67.

208 1719-21 Wisc. Ave., NW — Details of trellis.
Tino's. Restaurant

ACTION: Ret'd. for further study & subm. of accurate & consistent details. Suggest trellis structure relate to columns. Restrict extensive use of decorative grill. Request section thru cornice at trellis be studied at half size. Cornice size was shown differently in elevation & detail "X". Indicate treatment of cornice & wall where it abuts property line. Has any consideration been given to future use of an awning. The present scheme would be inadequate to incorporate such a feature, 5/9/67.

July 13, 1967

Dear Miss Adams:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered a design for a medal commemorating the 20th Anniversary of the Founding of San Antonio at its June 20th meeting.

We have no objection to the proposed design.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Eva Adams, Director
Bureau of the Mint
Treasury Department
Washington, D. C. 20220

EXHIBIT M

July 13, 1967

Dear General North:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the selection of Lorimer Rich as architect for a series of small monuments at its meeting on June 20th.

Though we have no specific objection to commissioning Lorimer Rich, we feel that it might be more appropriate for us to comment on a list of several architects. We would be glad to assist in compiling such a list at any time.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Major General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
2018 Munitions Building
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9808

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 9, 1967

Mr. EILBERG introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration

A BILL

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Catholic War Veterans are authorized to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian, the patron saint of the military, on the public street area, in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia, which is formed by the intersection of F Street, North Capitol Street, and Massachusetts Avenue, and which is known as Federal Reservation Number 78.

SEC. 2. The design and plans for such statue shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital

EXHIBIT O

Planning Commission, and the United States and the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this Act shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such statue is commenced within five years from the date of enactment of this Act, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the statue.

SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the statue erected under the provisions of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9808

A BILL

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EILBERG

MAY 9, 1967

Referred to the Committee on House Administration

RECEIVED
MAY 17 1967
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
HE
CTED

23 June 1967

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on H.R. 9808, 90th Congress, a bill "To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia."

The members of the Commission have authorized me to advise you that they have no particular comment as to the purpose of H.R. 9808.

If a memorial to the Catholic War Veterans is to be erected in the District of Columbia, we do feel that its site and design should be subject to approval by the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Omar Burleson
Chairman
Committee on House Administration
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT O

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 74

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 18, 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

Whereas the immediate vicinity of the National Capitol Building is the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government; and

Whereas Washington, District of Columbia, was originally carefully planned as an attractive city with facilities which for many years thereafter were adequate for the efficient functioning of the said branches of Government and of personnel associated therewith and interested therein and for the related movements of residents of and visitors to the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas as the city has grown in population, various supple-

EXHIBIT P

mental plans have been developed from time to time for the city as a whole and for individual portions thereof; and

Whereas the present population of the city far exceeds that of any time in the past and will undoubtedly continue to expand; and

Whereas the functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government and the number of persons associated therewith have likewise expanded greatly beyond the concepts of the initial planning process; and

Whereas the number of citizens who annually visit the Nation's Capital has increased to approximately seven million and is anticipated to continue to increase in future years; and

Whereas it is in the national interest that the United States Capitol Grounds and the contiguous related and influencing areas be developed and maintained so as to facilitate functions of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, the access and egress of persons associated therewith, the existence at all times of an esthetic setting therefor appropriate to the seat of the legislative and judicial branches of Government, of which all Americans can justly be proud, and which interested citizens will desire to visit and will find pleasure in doing so; and

Whereas the environs of the Capitol include many houses and other buildings of historical and esthetic importance whose preservation will contribute to the beauty and distinction of the Capital City and the Capitol Grounds; and

Whereas, in order that such grounds and areas be so developed and maintained it is necessary that a long-range comprehensive plan be formulated, adopted, continually administered and periodically updated to reflect future and presently

unpredictable growth and changes in environment and circumstances: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commission, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States with a consultant firm of national reputation having a working office within the Washington metropolitan area to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future development needs of the United States Capitol Grounds (as described in the Act of July 31, 1946, as amended (40 U.S.C. 193a)) and the contiguous and related influencing areas, and, on the basis of such study and analysis, prepare a comprehensive and detailed plan for the suitable development (over the next twenty years) of such grounds and areas. The consultant firm selected shall be properly qualified in all phases of the formulation of a comprehensive plan, including, but not limited to experience in related factors, such as growth trends, socioeconomic impacts, traffic flow and terminal facilities, costs and economic feasibility, civic center and parklike developments, esthetic considerations, controls imposed by subsurface conditions, design, operation and maintenance of public facilities, collection, codification and use of data related to planning proce-

dures previously prescribed by the Congress for urban areas, the preparation of factual and illustrated descriptive prospectuses and reports, and similar functions essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive plan. In preparing such comprehensive plan, due consideration shall be given to population growth of the Washington metropolitan area, population growth of the staffs which daily work in such grounds and their needs for access and egress, facilities required for the convenience of visitors to the grounds, buildings (their occupancy, use, and services), considerations of accessibility to and intercommunication between buildings and grounds, open green areas, priorities, relocations resulting from developments and all items hereinbefore mentioned as essential to the formulation of an adequate and realistic comprehensive plan. During the course of its work, the consultant firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process. A preliminary draft of the report to contain the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm shall be submitted in sixty copies not later than nine months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work for the review and comment of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the

Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other local agencies associated with the planning process, and within three months after the consultant firm has been provided with such comments, it shall provide to the Architect of the Capitol one thousand copies of a printed report, properly illustrated in color, defining the recommended comprehensive plan, outlining the actions required for its implementation, and containing a schedule of appropriations estimated to be required therefor.

SEC. 2. The contract referred to in the first section shall not be entered into until after the approval of the terms and conditions thereof by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, nor shall the plan referred to in the first section become the approved comprehensive plan until appropriate action has been taken by such committees.

SEC. 3. Inasmuch as a projected comprehensive plan must be modified from time to time to give proper recognition to future developments as they occur and which cannot necessarily be fully anticipated, the Architect of the Capitol in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commission, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract for the review of the approved comprehensive plan at intervals not greater than five years and to submit the results of

such review to the committees and other agencies mentioned in section 2 for appropriate consideration. Such periodic reviews should be made under contract with the same consultant firm which prepared the original comprehensive plan unless circumstances indicate otherwise.

SEC. 4. Inasmuch as the successful implementation of the plan requires that the buildings erected by the United States be of the highest architectural quality, the selection of the architects for such buildings shall be made by a committee which shall include representatives of the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the architectural profession.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 1.

22 June 1967

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts has no objection to the enactment of legislation proposed in S.J. Res. 74, 90th Congress, a bill "To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous and influencing areas."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Jennings Randolph
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT P

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1582

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 19, 1967

Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings and post offices outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the purpose of this Act to provide—

(1) for the maintenance of high standards of architectural design and art for public buildings and post offices outside the District of Columbia; and

EXHIBIT 9

(2) a program for the acquisition and preservation of suitable works of art for public buildings and post offices outside the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The term "public building" shall have the same meaning as is provided in section 13(1) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

SEC. 3. (1) The Public Advisory Panel on Architectural Services is hereby established in the General Services Administration. The Administrator shall appoint to the Panel at least twelve distinguished architects from among persons in private life professionally engaged in architecture, landscape architecture, or city planning, and at least six distinguished representatives of the fields of art allied to architecture, including painting (two members, of whom one shall be experienced in mural decoration), sculpture (two members, of whom one shall be experienced in sculpture related to the architectural environment), the decorative arts and crafts (one member), and interior design (one member), and such appropriate representatives of the Federal Government as the Administrator may desire to serve ex officio. The Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, shall be chairman of the Panel.

(2) The Administrator shall appoint the public members of the Panel from nominations submitted to him from time to time by the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, who shall recommend at least three persons for each position in a professional field for which a public member is to be appointed. The Chairman of the Endowment, in preparing lists of nominees, shall call upon the National Council on the Arts and the Endowment's advisory panels covering the fields of architecture, painting, sculpture, the decorative arts and crafts, and interior design, for advice and assistance, and shall give due consideration to any nominations submitted to the Endowment by established national organizations in the respective professional fields of art and architecture.

(3) Each public member of the Panel shall serve for a term expiring in one of the first three years succeeding the year in which he is appointed, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, subject to the limitation that not more than one painter and one sculptor may have a term scheduled to expire in the same calendar year. No public member of the Panel shall be eligible for reappointment for a term beginning less than two years after the expiration of his third consecutive term.

(4) Each public member of the Panel shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem for each day on

which he is engaged in the performance of his duties as such, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

(5) In order to insure that Federal public buildings, outside of the District of Columbia, and buildings leased to the United States for use by the Post Office Department, outside of the District of Columbia, may be enhanced by beauty, dignity, economy, utility, and suitable works of art, the Panel shall have the following functions:

(a) Develop and make recommendations to the Administrator and to the Postmaster General as to criteria for the evaluation and selection of, and contractual relationships with, architects for public buildings, and post office buildings, and with artists for works of art related to the total design concept of such buildings.

(b) Review General Services Administration design standards, criteria, guides, and procedures and recommend to the Administrator and to the Postmaster General any necessary or desirable changes to further the objectives and purposes of this Act.

(c) Advise the Administrator and the Postmaster General in the selection of architects for the design of nationally significant buildings designated by the Administrator or by

the Postmaster General, and of distinguished artists recommended by the architect of such building or by the Panel to work with the architect at the early planning stages.

(d) Review and advise the Administrator or the Postmaster General with respect to the acceptability of architectural design or works of art proposed for individual projects designated by the Administrator or by the Postmaster General.

(6) Meetings of the Panel shall be at the call of the Chairman or by request of three or more public members. The Panel shall maintain such records as are necessary and render such reports and submit such recommendations as may be requested by the Administrator or the Postmaster General or otherwise considered by the Panel as necessary to discharge its responsibilities under this Act. With the approval of the Administrator or the Postmaster General specified functions of the Panel may be performed by subpanels designated by the Administrator or by the Chairman of the Panel.

SEC. 4. The Administrator and the Postmaster General are authorized to acquire and maintain works of art for public buildings or for post offices, respectively, outside the District of Columbia. In addition to any amounts otherwise authorized, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for

this purpose in each fiscal year, to remain available until expended, an amount equal to 1 per centum of the total amount appropriated for the preceding fiscal year for the design and construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia. The Postmaster General shall endeavor to secure a similar level and quality of works of arts for buildings, outside the District of Columbia, leased to the United States for use by the Post Office Department.

SEC. 5. The Panel shall provide recommendations to the Administrator and to the Postmaster General concerning the artists and works of art under section 4. The Panel may, where appropriate, recommend to the Administrator and to the Postmaster General, respectively, the holding of competitions for the selection of artists and of designs or models of works of art.

23 June 1967

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing in reply to your request for the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on S. 1582, 90th Congress, a bill "To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings and post offices outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act."

The Commission generally favors any measure that will help to foster high standards of design in all cities of the United States where the Federal Government is involved in public building programs. We are by no means certain, however, that the particular method proposed in this legislation is the exact method which should be implemented. We feel it would be worthwhile to explore more thoroughly this and alternative ways of accomplishing the objectives of the legislation before any particular bill is enacted into law. We would be happy to consult with committees of Congress and others who are interested in this program for this purpose.

The Commission has been closely involved in similar activities for the last fifty-seven years within the city of Washington and upon occasion in other areas of both this country and in foreign countries at the request of various agencies of the Federal Government. This experience is valuable and could prove helpful in the establishment of future groups to accomplish similar purposes.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Jennings Randolph
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT 9

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1590

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 20, 1967

Mr. YARBOROUGH introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future space needs of the Congress.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—INCREASES IN SIZE OF CAPITOL BUILDING REQUIRING APPROVAL OF THE CONGRESS

SEC. 101. On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, no work shall be carried out with respect to any project which would alter the proportions, change the size, or modify

EXHIBIT R

the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, unless such project has been specifically authorized by legislation enacted by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING COMMISSION

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the "United States Capitol Building Commission" (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission") which shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) Two Members of the Senate be appointed by the President of the Senate, of whom one shall be appointed from the majority party and one from the minority party;

(2) Two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, of whom one shall be appointed from the majority party and one from the minority party;

(3) The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts or his designee;

(4) The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission or his designee;

(5) The Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Trust for Historic Preservation or his designee;

(6) Two members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, from at least six outstanding architects nominated by the American Institute of Architects;

(7) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Institute of Planners nominated by such association;

(8) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Society of Landscape Architects nominated by such association;

(9) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the Consulting Engineers Council nominated by such association;

(10) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the National Society of Professional Engineers nominated by such association;

(11) One member appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Historical Association nominated by such association;

(12) One member appointed by the President of the

United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from at least three members of the American Political Science Association nominated by such associations; and

(13) Two members from private life, appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The President of the United States shall designate as Chairman one of the members appointed pursuant to paragraphs 6 through 13 of subsection (a) of this section. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Nine members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(e) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as it deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Commission is also authorized to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of

title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed to $75 a day for individuals.

SEC. 202. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraph (3), (4), or (5) of section 201 (a) of this Act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of their membership on the Commission, but shall continue to receive the salary of their regular positions when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Such members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraphs 6 through 13 of section 201 (a) of this Act shall each receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(d) For the purposes of section 208 of title 18, United States Code, any member of the Commission appointed pursuant to paragraphs 6 through 13 of section 201 (a) of this Act shall be deemed to be an officer of an independent agency of the United States.

SEC. 203. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and analysis of the present and anticipated future needs of the United States Congress with respect to the Capitol Building, Capitol Grounds, and contiguous areas, including but not limited to study of workspace for the Members of Congress, committees of Congress, and staff personnel thereof, and facilities required for the convenience of visitors to the Capitol. It shall be the further duty of the Commission, on the basis of such study and analysis, to prepare and recommend a comprehensive and detailed development plan to meet the aforementioned needs. Such plan shall be prepared with the goal of preserving for future generations the historical integrity, proportions, and original materials of the Capitol Building, with particular emphasis upon preserving the existing architectural design.

SEC. 204. During the course of its study the Commission may submit to the President and the Congress such reports as the Commission shall consider advisable. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report with respect to its findings and recommendations not

later than one year following the date of the first meeting of the Commission. The report shall include the Commission's recommendations on procedures to govern the development and approval of the design of buildings in the Capitol area. Such procedures shall be dedicated to the end that buildings in the United States Capitol area should reflect the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government and should provide optimum facilities in an architectural style and form which embodies the finest American architectural thought.

SEC. 205. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 206. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 204 of this Act.

22 June 1967

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Commission of Fine Arts has no objection to the enactment of legislation proposed in S. 1590, 90th Congress, a bill "To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future space needs of the Congress."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Jennings Randolph
Chairman
Committee on Public Works
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT R

III. 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Hirschhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Gans, who will make the presentation on the Museum.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, go ahead.

MRS. SAARINEN: We should explain to him that we have been in here studying, so if we are sitting with our back to the plans it doesn't mean we haven't studied them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have looked at everything. It is not our first glimpse.

MRS. SAARINEN: Want us to start looking this way [Indicating]?

MR. GANS: No, that's all right.

I am just looking at what he had here.

MRS. SAARINEN: [Indicating] Your big site plan is down there.

MR. GANS: Well, this problem, of course, is the Hirschhorn Museum, the Sculpture Garden -- the two elements. And it is on a piece of property that has been given to the Smithsonian Institution between Independence and Madison and Seventh and Ninth. And the solution we are presenting is the circular building for the Museum -- a circular doughnut and a sunken garden for the Sculpture Court.

We have tried some rectangular buildings here, but

EXHIBIT 5'

we feel ~~there~~ in this environment -- the Air Museum, and the FAA Building, and the old Smithsonian -- and accenting, as this does, a cross axis across the mall -- that with a circular building we could get a very strong sculptural shape floating on this podium. And, as we got into it, we discovered, we think, that it worked very well for the kind of museum that we want.

Inner-ring; there are two eccentric circles, of quite a large scale. The entire diameter here is 240 feet, with 120 foot diameter on the inner court that is open to the sky. The whole thing is set on four enormous columns that would give us a span of actually about 180 feet. The entire circumference is about 220 feet. The inner perimeter is glassed. The exterior perimeter is solid. And the reason we did that, we think -- we wanted solid on the exterior, so we could hang the pictures and pieces of sculpture. But, as a person goes through this, the circulation would be this way [Indicating], ~~but that~~ there would be a relief as he comes out of these enclosed exhibit areas.

And there is a relief, I think, in looking into the court here. In the area here [Indicating]. We will have display pieces of sculpture against the wall.

There are two floors of exhibits. This is the gallery here, [Indicating]. And the top floor is administration and library, storage of paintings on these wall panels. It is not

really a cellar story; it is the kind of a story where students or anybody interested in painting can come up and go through it. It is more like a library stack, actually, than it is a storage place.

Now, the entrances to the Museum on the mall are really from three directions.

There is an entrance from Independence Avenue [Indicating], ~~which is where~~ to the Main Lobby ~~is with its~~ which has an escalator going down one flight, and one going up to the two galleried floors. The top floor for storage and library will be served by the elevator people, and will not be for tourists ~~will not be~~ visitors -- ~~they will be~~ but people who come for a specific purpose.

And the Mini-buses will run along in front of the building, on Jefferson Avenue. People will be able to get off here [Indicating], and go under the building, and come into the Court, into the Main Lobby, and have access to the escalator or the stairs, or the elevators that go up or down.

And the third entrance, which we think is very important, is the entrance for the people ~~that are~~ who walking, ~~coming~~ along the mall, and they can come down into this sunken Court here [Indicating], and enjoy it; but, also, have direct access to the restaurant and auditorium, and the galleries for temporary displays, changing displays, on this floor [Indicating], and come up to these galleries on the upper floors.

(Sculpture Garden)

This -- We have tried to give this really the scale of a mall. It's long, it's deep, it's about eight or nine feet on this end, because ~~of the slope of the ground~~ the ground slopes. ~~And~~ It is about fifteen feet here, so we can get under to ~~get to~~ enter the restaurant. ~~And~~ The Mini-buses on the road go over this piece of construction here [Indicating]. And we think of this as a pool ~~in there of~~ about 1500 by 100 feet, which ~~we think~~ is the scale of the project, and, more or less, the scale of the Reflecting Pool in front of the Lincoln Memorial. ~~And~~, Around it, we are thinking not of hard batting, but more of a gravel and sand mixture; something like the Tuileries, or something, where people would just wander around, and there will be pieces of sculpture displayed. ~~And~~ In front of the restaurant, we can visualize that there might be tables. ~~They~~ People can come out there for refreshments on good days. ~~And~~ So it should be a fairly lively place.

Now, it's sunken, of course, so that we don't destroy the grand sweep of the mall, and the infiltration of the Capitol in back. And I think, ~~that~~, with this scale here, that you can't get very far away from this, and it would not be visible. I think you have to go quite high up on the Capitol step to get anywhere near to looking down into this sunken garden. These stairways come down opposite the existing streets -- I think they are Adams and Washington. But, eventually, of course, there will be no cars there, ~~but~~,

~~also~~, I think eventually these streets will disappear -- they are not meant in the final plan to be roads. I think there will be trees there. And the circulation down the mall will be amongst these trees here. There will be walks. Sort of ~~like~~, again, like the Tuileries, or alongside the Champs Elysees. But all the circulation will be going down the mall. The pedestrians will be under these trees on either side, and in the Mini-buses along this road, and over on Madison.

MRS. SAARINEN: How deep is the cut? I'm sorry. It's eight or nine feet, you said, on the left-hand side?

MR. GANS: This is about 15 feet here, so we can get under the restaurant.

MRS. SAARINEN: And that railing is in addition to that?

MR. GANS: That is just a railing in addition to that.

MRS. SAARINEN: How high would that be about -- two or three feet?

MR. GANS: Three -- something like that. Yeh.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What is the exterior material of the building?

MR. GANS: Well, the exterior material -- at the moment we are thinking about a travertine -- I mean -- you know.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I shouldn't have to ask.

MR. GANS: I think, here in Washington, it has to be

warm. I think it has to be light.

MRS. SAARINEN: Is this also travertine?

MRS. GANS: Exactly. We are thinking the whole pattern will be in travertine. We talk about a travertine interior, for the gallery walls will be plaster.

MRS. SAARINEN: Could you describe what you have?

MR. GANS: On this one we had before -- we had a balcony, and opening on all three floors here; and we had it on the four corners.

MRS. SAARINEN: You mean the way it is on the model?

MR. GANS: Here [Indicating] it is. Where the stairs is -- in other words, we accentuated the stairs here in the four corners. As we were thinking about it, these don't go anywhere. They were meant to give relief, as you walk around. But, actually, you have the relief on the inside of the inner perimeter. So, we have eliminated these, and just have one on this access here, so that we can have a large --

MRS. SAARINEN: The rest would be solid?

MR. GANS: The rest would be solid.

So we have a larger area here with a balcony. [Indicating] And behind it would be a real large sculpture studio, and then you would be facing -- [Indicating] Actually, you would be right here in the center. It would be on this access, and overlook ~~then~~ the pool, and all the activity that

is going on in that area.

MR. KELLY: Three floors?

MR. GANS: No, the second floor. Making the second floor really something we are talking about -- a horizontal window, with a balcony.

MR. KELLY: You wouldn't repeat this on the library side?

MR. GANS: No, we are not thinking of repeating it. I mean this is just what we are studying at the moment.

MRS. SAARINEN: Would this be a projecting balcony, or what?

MR. GANS: I don't know.

MRS. SAARINEN: You haven't studied it?

MR. GANS: No.

MR. ROSZAK: These radiating lines -- are they going to be in sort of a metal or cement~~e~~ -- I mean the lines themselves? The joints?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just joints.

MR. GANS: I don't know if it is travertine. What we want to do here -- I think this elevation shows it as much as anything -- ~~that~~ what we would like ~~would be~~ to have is a really strong mass here [Indicating], particularly against the FAA Building. And what we are trying to develop now would be four columns. There is a structural ceiling under here that would be very rich -- a deep coffer ceiling. That kind of

thing. A deep coffered ceiling would really give a decorative, and rich, and very strong effect to the pedestrian walking along here. And I think that's working out very well. But I think the circular form, as I say, is a strength; and I think it fits here on the access, on the termination at this cross access -- at the termination of the cross access. I think it has a sort of gaiety. I think it doesn't destroy the character of the old Smithsonian.

MRS. SAARINEN: Could I ask you a question?

You say the diameter is about 240 feet?

MR. GANS: Um-hum.

MRS. SAARINEN: How did you arrive at this size? Was this determined by the program, or by --

MR. GANS: Yes. We have a program, and money. We have a dollar value on the entire thing.

MR. WARNECKE: That seems quite adequate, doesn't it?

MR. GANS: As a matter of fact, it is adequate for the program that was given us initially.

MR. WARNECKE: How many dollars a square foot?

MRS. SAARINEN: The building is $15 million.

MR. GANS: It is roughly about 250,000 square foot, and at $40 it is $10,000,000. Then, there is the garden, about $2.4 million.

MR. WARNECKE: Is the travertine marble the strip

color. A dead redhead sitting would really look
decorative, and Frank and Vera Ewing either do the pantomime
walking along Lake. And I think that's nothing out of all,
But I think the circular form, as I say, is a strong
and I think it will have it's access on the principal
at this exact moment -- as the combination of the three
access. I think it has a kind of quality. I like the
destroy the character of the old Smithsonian.

MR. SHAPIRO: Could I ask you a question?

You say the diameter is about 300 feet.

MR. CAGE: One-- no.

MRS. SHAPIRO: How old you artist at this stage
Was this determined by the process, or by --

MR. CAGE: Yes. We have a program, and every.
We have a dollar value on the entire thing.

MR. MARCUCKE: This area only assumes, does
lev

MR. GINS: Is a matter of fact, it is assumed th
the program that was given us initially.

MR. MARCUCKE: How many dollars a square foot

MRS. SHAPIRO: The building is $12 million.

MR. CAGE: It is roughly about 250,000 square
feet, and at $40.00 to $10,000,000. Then, I also is
above $12.4 million.

MR. MARCUCKE: Is the elevation usable

marble you are talking about? Are you talking about the Lincoln type?

MR. GANS: I am talking about the Beaumont Theater type. There are all different kinds of travertine.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is a rather creamy one.

MR. GANS: Yes, it is a tan thing; it is rich. It's warm, it's light and it's warm. It is really the kind of thing I think you should have here.

MR. WARNECKE: What is the Air Museum? Isn't that a pink to match the Mellon -- didn't we try to do that?

CHAIRMAN WLLTON: The faintest. Really, it is an aggregate, but it is only faintly colored.

MR. GANS: It is a precast stone. Is it a pre-cast stone?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Um-hum. But it isn't as pink as the Mellon, I don't think. The way I remember it.

MR. WARNECKE: I see that you particularly have an identical corner site to the Air Museum. Did you try to get that, or are you trying to achieve that?

MR. GANS: No. Not necessarily. But we have a total limit here in the city. And We marked this from sea level, so we don't get confused. And This is 110. And The Air Museum piece elevations are marked all in here [Indicating]. So ours is 110; and this is 111 above sea level. I mean you just see this faint line above here.

exactly you are talking about. Are you talking about

the Lincoln type?

DR. CAMP: I am talking about the Brannon

Tunnel type. There are all different types of conveyors.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is a rather strong one.

DR. CAMP: Yes, it is a very strong; it is also.

It's warm, it's light and it's warm. It is a terrific

kind of thing I think you should have here.

DR. WARNECKE: What is the difficulty? It's just

a plan to melt the ration -- drop's we cap or do it?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The fairness. Really, it is

an aggregate, but it is only fairly coarse.

DR. CAMP: It is a pressed steam. Is it a pre-

cast stone?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Um-hum. You can't do it

as dry Melton, I don't think. You may I remember it.

DR. WARNECKE: I see that you particularly have an

industrial venture site to the Air Force. Now you may be

get that, as are you trying to develop one

DR. CAMP: No. Not necessarily. We are looking

total limit here in the city. We've moved this from the

Level, so we don't yet confined. Now I'm in it. We I

Air Force, place elevations are moving all in Mayo

[Indiscernible]. So once in it; and this is all above sea

level. I guess you just see this fall line above here.

But, actually, ~~what we have done~~ since then -- this has come down about three feet now, because we have eliminated some of the mechanical up in this upper floor here, and put it down below.

MR. KELLY: I was going to ask that. You seem to have some space left on the site below for dumping things underneath. I wondered if you had considered lowering the building.

MR. GANS: We had lowered the building.

MR. KELLY: About three feet?

MR. GANS: Three or four feet.

What we have now -- actually, we have 14 feet clear here. Then, we got a tremendous load coming down here. We have a depth -- we have a girder of 10 feet. So this is 10 feet in here [Indicating], and 14. That's 24. And then we have 15-foot galleries here; at four. So we have got three 19; and four 24. And I think it is 85 feet.

MRS. SAARINEN: Both gallery floors are 15.

MR. GANS: Yes, 15 clear. Gallery floors are 15 clear, with a four-foot construction. So the whole thing, from this on to the very top, comes to 85 feet, which is less than this [Indicating]. I think it is three or four feet less than this one.

MR. WARNECKE: Did you study a lower building? Or

This has come down about three feet, because it was
illustrated some of the machinery of the food energy distribution, and put it back below.

MR. GRANT: I was going to say that. We have some space left on the site value for dwelling purposes. I wonder if you had considered locating the utilities.

MR. JAMES: We have thought of utility.

MR. WESLEY: Above ground?

MR. CAMP: Three at five feet.

Then we have one -- [indistinct] we have it here
along here. Then, we put a [indistinct] and having them here.
We have a duct -- we have a place to [indistinct]. We have
to feel in here [indistinct], and [indistinct]. That's it.
And then we have [indistinct] utilities here; are there.
So we just get there by not [indistinct]. And I think it is
so easy.

MR. DAVIDSON: With utilities floors [indistinct].

MR. CAMP: Yes, it is true. Unless there is a
clear, with a floor-to-floor connection. So the whole concept
then ends up on the very top, rooms-to-be rent. It
[indistinct] [inaudible]. I think it is there or not
[indistinct] with this one.

MR. [illegible]: Has you already a [illegible]

was it just the program? Or did you want it this way?

MR. GANS: This is the program for areas, for exhibit space and all the ancillary services. There is no fat in here, really. As I say, we were given the program, but also the money.

What we did -- we put everything in the exhibit space, so it came out with what was left over really. But it's close. It's close.

MR. KELLY: Your platform is, as nearly as you can make it, the grade along the Mini-bus street?

MR. GANS: It is the grade along Mini-bus street, and you come down a few steps here to Independence. [Indicating] So that it is on grade here. So the Mini-bus people would come in here, and go in the entrances on this side of the lobby, and then go up from there.

I think also this will be a very important entrance.

MR. KELLY: On the pool, where the Sculpture Court is, had you considered using a natural grade instead of a retaining wall?

MR. GANS: Like a fern?

MR. KELLY: You wanted something quite formal?

MR. GANS: You have to have something.

MR. GANS: The whole thing is down one of these -- one of these. That has really just disappeared. The mall is

was it just the program? Or did you want it only any-

MR. GAMB: This is the program for space, but

capable space and all the facilities available. There's no

one in here, really. As I say, it will be like the Universe

one also the more.

What we did -- we put output in the normal

space, so it came out with what was left-over really. Sec-

ler's close. It's close.

MR. KELLY: Your platform is, as nearly as you can

make it, the ground along the Mid-east ridges?

MR. GAMB: It is the pride along Mid-Line street,

and you come down a few more here to Independence.

[Inaudible] So that it is on state 'ar'. So the Multi-

people would come in here, and go to the Delaware or else made

of the Library, and then go to the free floor.

I think also that will be a very important

audience.

MR. KELLY: On the pad, where is Corporate Comp-

is, had you considered using a normal grade instead of

existing wall?

MR. GAMB: Sir --

MR. KELLY: You wanted something multi-storey?

MR. GAMB: You have to have room-to-run.

MR. GAMB: The whole thing is down to a very --

one of cases. That has really just disappears. The wall is

not absolutely level. You know, it goes this way. [Indicating] But you would, presumably, see the railing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Presumably, unless you are blind. It is three feet high. Let us not pretend it doesn't exist.

MR. GANS: Could we show the railing? [Indicating]

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Anyone have any more questions?

[Silence]

Thank you for your presentation, which is very articulate.

MR. KELLY: I guess I do have one more question. There is a little difference between one of the models, and one of the others -- between what the separating arc is between that and the Smithsonian. One of them looks as though it were a hedge, and another one a regular wall.

MRS. SAARINEN: Excuse me. If you look at the plan here, there is both the hedge and then there is the line of trees.

MR. KELLY: The thing up here [Indicating] shows the curve as green.

MR. GANS: It wouldn't be a wall.

MRS. SAARINEN: No, it is a hedge. It's green planting, isn't it?

MR. GANS: Speaking of that, there is a marvelous

MR. KELLY: I guess I do have one more question. There is a little difference between one of the models, and one of the others -- between what the narrator says is between rock and the bridgework. One of them looks as though it were a bridge, and another one a regular wall.

MRS. CARLSON: Excuse me. If you look at the plan here, there is both the walks and also this is the line of trees.

MR. KELLY: The thing up here [indicating] where the curve ac green.

MR. CARR: I should'n be a wall.

MRS. SARGENT: Oh, it is a bridge. It's green planting, isn't it?

MR. CARR: Anything at all, where is a natural

tree right here.[Indicating] You know, just off Jefferson Drive. There is a marvelous tree, and that just fits in there, and that's going to stay in there. And there are some very good trees back on Independence. There are three or four trees that will remain. And there is one across the street -- a great oak. That's an elm, I think. And there is a great oak across the street, which I think also can stay.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good. Thanks very much.

Charlie?

MR. ATHERTON: We have the Sculpture Garden drawings on the wall. Or, else we could move the Ellipse.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: John [Woodbridge], as you know, we are not starting from scratch. Let us not repeat old material. Why don't we present our comments to you, John.

We felt that on the last one you saw the area for sculpture was getting to be rather a residual of the ring thing. And we wanted to re-establish a continuity circulation around the perimeter, get you up to some places where you could look back into the center and establish a series of inner relations at different levels from the perimeter band to the central element.

MRS. SAARINEN: Don't you feel that these [Indicating] really just don't do exactly what you have said -- which was, in other words, that this idea of the circulation around, I think, is nice; and the different

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on June 21st considered the designs for the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden on the Mall at 10th Street, S. W.

After careful study the Commission approved the design of the building. Foremost in the consideration of this project is the suitability of this structure within the setting of the entire Mall complex. The circular form and the general massing fit in quite well in this particular location which, of course, is on the 10th Street cross axis of the Mall.

The Commission does have reservations about the details of the sculpture garden however. The vertical walls which at some points approach 16' in height constitute a definite cut across the Mall and this certainly must be studied further. We recommend that consideration be given to using only low walls of uniform height along the pool terrace and compensate for the differences in grade with a sloping grass berm on both the east and west sides of the garden. This would probably eliminate the trench-like effect of the present scheme and also reinforce the continuity of the center grass panel as seen along the axis of the Mall.

The Commission would also like to see some additional study given to the landscape treatment surrounding the base of the Museum. The present proposal calls for an extensive area of stone paving. Experience in Washington makes this treatment very questionable because of the glare and heat of the summer sun.

This submission, of course, is only a preliminary design and the Commission expects that these and perhaps other details as well will be given much further study.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C. 20405

EXHIBIT S2

MR. WOODBRIDGE: If you prune them, then you start getting an even sprawl. It seems, with this walk, you need a good shade.

MR. SASAKI: I think, with spread -- I think the linden would be better -- 60 feet with the linden; the oak, 30 to 40 feet. I measured.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's go back and sit down.

[The Commissioners returned to the conference room.]

MRS. SAARINEN: What are we about to take up?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Geological Survey Building.

III. b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building, Reston, Va.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are you doing the Geological Survey? What's happened to the West Coast Office?

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Netsch of Nottingham-Doolittle, on Geological Survey Building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We do remember Reston, and we do remember the circumstances of the building being put out there. So we can start from there.

MR. NETSCH: Very good.

I should add that the project is in the stage of what is called "diagrammatics" in the parlance of governmental presentation -- which means that full presentation of tentatives is not due until December of this year. So what we have to present to you today is the site plan; the concept

EXHIBIT T'

MR. WOODWARDE: If you please, then I move

putting an area aground. It seems, with this small, one need

a good steed.

MR. SASAKI: I calve, with spread -- I think it

Linden would be better -- 60 flat with six lineal; one yes; 32

to Au feet. I measured.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's go back and get down.

[The Commissioners returned to the conference room.]

MRS. SAARINEN: What are we about to take up?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Geological Survey Building.

III. b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building,

Reston, Va.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are you doing the Geological

Survey? What's happened to the West Coast Office?

MR. ATHERTON: Mr. Heacock of Pettingell-Pfeiffer,

on Geological Survey Building.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We do remember Calvo, and we do

remember the circumstances of the building being put out

there. Do we can start from there.

MR. MEYER: Very good.

I should add that the project is on the shore of

what is called 'Wiggenmeier's' in the vicinity of Reservoir

presentation -- which means that full presentation of

tentative is not due until December of this year. As what

we have to present to you today is the site plan; the concept

EXHIBIT I

of the building; and the concept of the plan itself.

The Survey -- for a brief resume -- as you probably are aware is responsible for mapping water resources, geological surveys, in this and other portions of the world; the conservation of public lands. It has about 2300 people in the Washington area, in about 28 different locations. And it has, over-all, about 8,000 people. It is not an expanding group in the Washington area. It is actually holding its own. Elements have really been spun off.

The unique problem of having the 50-acre site was how to use the quality of the land, which is totally undeveloped [Indicating], and is sitting in woods.

I will move this down for the whole group.

There are two new villages, which will be constructed at Reston. This one [Indicating], they are in, ~~hopes~~, will contain a community college, which may use or utilize some of the talents that are existing in this survey and in the geologists and engineers present.

Therefore, it seemed important to us to try to devise a pedestrian and communication environment between the two communities, and we went through a whole series of site studies as to the utilization of the land, and the communication for the people working there.

It became apparent to us very, very quickly that a so-called campus plan, which isolated small buildings by the

of the building; and the purpose of any plan [illegible].

The survey -- for a brief moment -- as [illegible] campaign to [illegible] the campus [illegible] central campus, to [illegible] the west [illegible] the conservation of public lands. It [illegible] to [illegible] to the Washington area, to secure [illegible] [illegible] And it has, overall, been [illegible]. It is [illegible] community [illegible] in the Washington area. It is [illegible] valuable [illegible]. Elements [illegible] [illegible].

The [illegible] problem of having the [illegible] how to use the [illegible] of the land, while it [illegible] developed [location], and is [illegible].

I will move this [illegible] the [illegible].

[illegible] are two [illegible] which will be [illegible] or [illegible]. This one [location], that [illegible], will contain a community college, which [illegible] [illegible] of the college that [illegible] [illegible] geology and [illegible].

Therefore, it seemed important to [illegible] develop a [illegible] and [illegible] environment [illegible] the community, and we must [illegible] a [illegible] [illegible] enable us to [illegible] utilization of the land, and the [illegible] plan for the people [illegible].

It [illegible] important to me [illegible] that a [illegible] campus plan, which [illegible] small [illegible] of the

individual size currently of the institution, of the various parts of the institution -- the provisions would really not develop the kind of communication that the director and the staff were looking for. In fact, one of the things you can see very quickly from these studies is a kind of important relationship between the staff members, for each of the divisions; and then the need for communication within each division.

[Indicating] That is what this chart was developed to interrelate. And you can also see quite a disparity in the character of each division -- obviously, the red, and the dark red, and the purple represent laboratory spaces. ~~And~~ They vary in size. ~~And~~ You can also see the kind of work; the private offices; how they do vary.

~~And~~ You can see, in the second chart -- which was a part of the diagrammatic study to search for the character of this kind of organization, administratively -- both, in a sense, horizontally and vertically.

This leads us to a belief that it would be most advantageous for Survey to keep them essentially in one structure. And they tried to work on a series of forms which allowed for change in variation of the various sizes of the individual program elements. The site itself ~~has just~~ -- it is not virgin land. But it has a tremendous number of trees. We have been fortunate that they all look like this,

[Indicating] We have got about 9,000 trees planted on this site, and they are all by number. And the quality of each tree has been recorded, and the size, the type. We have had Dr. Zickefoose of the Geological Survey Staff orient us as to the character of the tree cover, and the method of conservation, in order to preserve as many of the trees as possible.

The scheme itself follows the one primary land ridge through the site. It presents, too, the pedestrian and a non-automotive view. And it preserves the knoll in the foreground, which would eventually relate to Dulles Expressway; as a public area, in a sense, the canteen-cafeteria to the site itself.

It also -- Although this model does not show it, because these extra pieces are not visible; and the large site plan is not present. But I can show you on the small site plan the development of a secondary street, which places all the service activities between two building volumes, and does not expose them to the countryside, or to the access ways.

The other thing that we have done on the site plan, which is more clearly shown -- and you may have seen it on the very large plan -- is that they have followed the topography for the parking areas in developing green swales between. So that people can walk in the natural land cover,

tree cover, as much as possible.

The building itself, and its plan -- and we located for you --

MRS. SAARINEN: Do you want to lift those up?

MR. NETSCH: I'm sorry. Oh, they do lift.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If they lift up there, we see them better.

Aline, do you think Robert Indiana is working for them?

MR. NETSCH: There are two of them. There is a Robert Indiana in the office.

MR. ROSZAK: They are better. They are more interesting.

MR. NETSCH: What we have tried to do with these two -- again, these relate back to these programs; again, you see the colors of the laboratory elements; and the color, yellow, of the administrative groups. You can see how each of the groups relates in terms of administration and laboratory.

MRS. SAARINEN: Excuse me for interrupting. I am curious. For most centers like this, this is not true -- is this program that fixed; so that, in other words, you don't have to be able to convert from a laboratory to an office; or an office to a laboratory?

MR. NETSCH: We do so, in some of these peripheral areas. But you must remember this is a National Headquarters

case covers, as well as possible.

The building itself, and its plans -- are to be

locked for now --

MRS. DARLING: So you want to file charges

MR. DARLING: I'm sorry. Oh, dang it all!

CHAIRMAN WHITE: If you will let me finish, we may

come better.

Allen, do you think Buddy Taylor is capable

for that?

MR. MERTON: There are two of them. Clyde is

Bobbee Indiana in the office.

MR. DUPLEX: They are devices. Don't use this

incorrectly.

MR. MERTON: What we have tried to do this --

-- again, these police have to follow procedure; Allen, you

see the colors of the laboratory elements; and the color,

yellow, of the administrative memos. Tell me the top

of the pyramid relative to terms of identification and Duplex.

MRS. DARLING: Because of the information. I'm

confuse. For male concern like this, that is not just --

this progressive steel flows; as that, however, we just

have to be able to convert from a laboratory to an office;

urban office-to a laboratory!

MR. MERTON: We do so, it were of some personnel

agent, that you're somewhere else in a different identification

with two roles. The people up here [Indicating] are responsible for the six offices throughout the nation, plus the men working in the field.

MRS. SAARINEN: I see.

MR. NETSCH: As well as to policies which go towards the White House and the Government.

MRS. SAARINEN: I was just curious.

MR. NETSCH: Yes, you are right. There are offices in here which have flexibility issues. But the role up here is a larger one than just the national one.

MRS. SAARINEN: I see.

MR. NETSCH: And you can also see that by discipline, you might say, ~~that~~ we have been able to keep, ~~say~~, geology together on two separate floors; topography, water resources; ~~and that we are able~~, Without going into a long discussion of what we call "field theory," or the development of the 45 degree line to the 90 degree line, in the rotation of the square -- without going into this, in great detail, we are finding it is a way we can modulate space in terms of group areas, and private areas, the field at allows~~for~~ both linear and radial systems to exist in harmony in the same kind of structure. It ~~to~~ allows us, for example, to change the organization of a floor in one direction, or in volumetric way in another -- when the form of the plan, and the relationship of the insides seem appropriate to go in this

manner [Indicating] rather than in this manner [Indicating].

At the same time, we have following through the whole scheme a series of service corps which feed every floor.

The rotational capability of field theory does several things for us, we think, on this particular problem, and we think it is appropriate.

It develops an esthetic, which allows us to change form and size, without the uncomfortable combination of rectilinear forms coming together, and we are able to make an aggregative kind of esthetic; rather than trying to get a perfect form next to another perfect form; next to another perfect form.

The other thing on this particular one -- and this is an application which is specific to this building: The square that you notice in this area [Indicating] is larger than the square in this area [Indicating]. It gives us a maximum amount of perimeter.

If you notice, we have a large amount of offices. And they required, in the program, outside, light. And we are in the middle of this woods, and it seemed slightly inappropriate to hide them inside. It allows us to maximize this edge condition without increasing the volume of any particular form beyond that which we needed inside.

And, secondly, we have chosen a base facing of 25 feet, which then we use on the diagonal for 35 feet; which

allows us to rotate the column locations, and get various size column-free spaces within the building.

Now, this means, for example, that if you look at the building in this direction, which shows on the elevation, ~~that we look -- we happen to have this~~ -- you are looking at the 35 foot or the diagonal span. Here, you are looking at the 25 foot on the point. If we reverse this, the 35 foot would look like the 25 foot. And, so, we develop a kind of optical relationship between five and seven, in which you are looking in one direction. You get the illusion of the hypotenuse of the triangle related to the side. And it is this form, as it moves about in and among trees, that we think will be an important point in not establishing too large a bulk in the environment.

We are studying the elevations. We have no elevations to present. Obviously, with December as a deadline, no architect would be ready in June ~~-- if he had to December~~ -- a sane one anyway. We are studying, for example, the relationship of reflective surfaces in reflecting the trees in the environment; the relationship of capitalizing on this interesting optical relationship of five and seven -- when is seven five; and when is it seven. And then to try to relate an important aspect of the floor plan, which shows on the first floor, especially. These were presented to you, so you could overlay, ~~as you wish~~ -- not as you wish, but you

allows us to locate the volume functionally and use the resulting clear column-free spaces within the building.

Now, as a result, the facade, like the rest of the building in this direction, would look as in the elevation, at the 35 foot or the diagonal bay. Here, you see the facade at the 25 foot on the point. If we rotate this, the face would look like the 25 foot. Ah, so, by changing a kind of optical relationship between this and these, we notice how are looking in one direction. You get the illusion of the hypotenuse of the triangle related to the base. Then it is this form, as it moves about it and these cases, the plan will be an important point in not establishing how large a bulk in the environment.

We are studying the directions. By doing so different options to present. Obviously, with Descartes as a baseline, no architect would be ready to [illegible] a value one answer. We are arguing. The complex relationship of reflexity surfaces to [illegible] the issue in the environment; the relationship of complexities in only interesting optical relationship of five and seven -- three-to-seven five; and when is it seven. And when is it [illegible] an important aspect of the three plan, which comes in the first floor, especially. These were presented as [illegible] you could overlay, [illegible] out of you what, but you

could see how the forms build up. But a very important aspect of the ground floor, with its main street going through the site, with the opportunity of getting not only a main entrance, but for the 2500 people who will be here every day -- the opportunity to come in through the woods on all of these points.

And so we come in -- we tie onto the main street, which goes from the cafeteria, the health service, personnel, the auditorium, the map service (which is a public purchasing group -- the only public group out here) back to the preparation of the maps in the factory.

So we have a kind of main street which goes in and out to the woods, and then goes down to the cafeteria, which fits in the knoll, which you see within the knoll in the foreground of the building.

MRS. SAARINEN: In the model it looks as if you have one area which ~~is sort of~~ has the stacks ~~are~~ on top of each other.

MR. NETSCH: Yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: And then this business of them being swayed in different areas happens in the other area? Or are they all on top each other? In other words, there seems to be a conflict between what the model shows, and what the plan shows.

MR. NETSCH: No. The stacking that you read from

could see how the Seers could do. One I very impressive
aspect of the Seers Stage, with its grey velvet drapes and
the air, with the expectancy of [illegible] audience
audience, but for the Seers' performance with no [illegible]
-- the opportunity to see [illegible] on their
chess points.

And as we come to -- we [illegible] the main
stage, which goes from [illegible] the back [illegible]
centuries), the entertainment [illegible] (which is a
public [illegible] -- we will [illegible] for
them by the presentation of the Keys to the Castle.

So we have a line of [illegible] each one
said one to the woods, and [illegible] by the Seers
whose fate in the hall, which [illegible]
the [illegible] of the building.

MRS. DAVIDSON: It [illegible] I [illegible]
have one eyes which [illegible] or [illegible] one or [illegible]
each other.

MR. WEISS: Yes.

MRS. DAVIDSON: And they were [illegible]
being swayed in different [illegible] in the [illegible]
away? Or were they [illegible] on top [illegible]? It [illegible]
there seems to be a conflict between [illegible]
and what the [illegible] wants.

MR. WEISS: No. The [illegible] can [illegible]

the model is the administrative element as it begins to build through. You see, it begins to follow this column spacing.

MRS. SAARINEN: Right.

MR. NETSCH: We could have made an esthetic choice and not followed it.

MRS. SAARINEN: What I am trying to figure out is what happens to the other?

MR. NETSCH: The others are what we call "a lattice." As I say, I don't want to go through the whole evolution of this.

MRS. SAARINEN: I am curious. Do they --

MR. NETSCH: These overlap, and this is an edge over it to condition. From this, we go to the linear at the end. So we move edge, lattice, linear.

MR. KELLY: As you extend away from the main block, you are principally in laboratory space?

MR. NETSCH: This is a laboratory cluster of three units.

MR. KELLY: The yellows are the stacks?

MR. NETSCH: These are the vertical stacks coming through.

MR. KELLY: Would you have some trouble with them on your rough elevations?

MR. NETSCH: We have been careful to put chemistry and geology on the lowest floor to the rear, so when they come

through, they come through not at the upper echelon, but they come through at the lower. They do have to come through. You are right, Burnham. They will be fans, clustered about an exhaust. I think we could handle it architecturally. I would not have wanted it up here, but they are down here and here.[Indicating]

MR. WARNECKE: We have seen so many plans that we have inherited -- this Commission -- the National Institute of Health, hospitals, and so forth -- over a period of many, many years. They keep adding buildings beyond that which they conceive in the beginning. Do you look at this as a building which you are adding onto, or a master plan; or hope that it never will be added onto?

MR. NETSCH: No, that's the whole reason that field theory got started, in the first place; which actually has been developed at colleges and universities, to try to find a way that we could expand buildings, and not have that permanent edge.

We assume that we will now start, as Lee mentioned earlier -- we will now start an overlap situation of another rotated square for addition to administration. We continue the evolution of the laboratory wing in another portion of a rotated square, which will begin, as you can see, very symmetrically and come down, and then can swing off, and then join this facility which Dr. Corra wants tentatively located

as a special, let's say, restricted facility location.

MR. KELLY: What's that?

MR. NETSCH: It's just -- We don't know. But he wants the provision on the site.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There is one element of --

MR. NETSCH: -- of security in there already. And it might move out, and others might move over there.

But you can see the tendency; and this does move. We can move. And the purpose for showing this as expansion is it allows the laboratories to expand for every level.

MR. WARNECKE: You are thinking of adding on and making one sprawling --

MR. NETSCH: The whole thing becomes matrix -- one building and court. It is hardly a building; I would rather say "environment."

MR. WARNECKE: System.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What about parking?

MR. NETSCH: We have provision for 1500 cars on the upper side and the flat land. So we do the minimum amount of grading. We, also, ~~take in and~~ try to save the nice trees, and there is expansion to the side ~~to~~ for about 600 more cars, when we figure the initial expansion.

MR. KELLY: As the building expands, is there going to be any planned exterior park that you plan to use -- not as campus?

as a special, let's say, restricted density location.

MR. KELLY: What's good?

MR. DEITCH: It's just -- We don't want, you know, waste the provision on the site.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: There is the concept of --

MR. DEITCH: -- of security in their sites.

And it might move out, and create other more space.

But you can use the taxpayer; and this case here, we can move. And the purpose for adding this or removing is it allows the landscapers to remove the scary level.

MR. WARSCHAW: You are alluding it adding on and making one operation --

MR. DEITCH: The whole term "economic" -- the building and cost. It is worth a building, I could remove any "environment."

MR. WARSCHAW: Sylvan.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: What about [illegible]

MR. DEITCH: We have provision for both [illegible] upper side and the flat land. So we do the [illegible] premise. We, also, [illegible] to save the [illegible] and there is access on to the side [illegible] when we figure the total amount.

MR. KELLY: By the building [illegible] to be any [illegible] [illegible] -- you [illegible]

MR. NETSCH: Here it strikes a land form which is very long.

MR. KELLY: Anything else is free for expansion?

MR. NETSCH: Anything else is free for expansion. We are holding that public woods, which is the public entrance; the cafeteria, and that development outside space.

MR. KELLY: There might be some actually relatively formal landscaping out of that area.

MR. NETSCH: Formal -- not in terms of the mall, but formal in terms of the woods, yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: It is quite fascinating, but I am just curious philosophically: Does this kind of organic -- and without a kind of anchoring center -- form seem particularly appropriate to you, because this was this rural site; or just as an abstract principle did it appeal?

MR. NETSCH: I will be perfectly honest. This is a principle we have been working on for about three years, especially in areas of laboratories. We did not know initially whether it would be applicable here. I can show you, if you are curious, if you are interested in terms of a city application, which is quite different in form. And you will see very quickly there is no need for the end physical result to be the same. This is a system again which is going to grow, and you can see how.

MRS. SAARINEN: The reason that I asked was that

MR. MCISAAC: I will be perfectly honest. This is a principle we have been working on for some time, especially in areas of landscaping. We wish now whether it would be applicable here. I can show you if you are curious, if you can see [illegible] time, which is quite different in form. and you will see quickly there is no need for the old [illegible] area. This is a system again which is going to [illegible] can see now.

MRS. SAUNDERS: The reason that I asked was that

because of -- well, really, this kind of changing vista thing. I think, from the outside, it is hard to get a basic structural idea; whereas, I think in this environment that can be very pleasant and very good.

MR. NETSCH: Its wonderful, because there is a field of trees about. We have almost a kind of natural grid, a grid of nature on, you know, on random centers. And we hoped that these will kind of march in and the facade of the building will sort of fit in.

MRS. SAARINEN: When you talk about reflective centers, are you thinking of maritime or something like that?

MR. NETSCH: It is an image. As I say, it is not finally decided on. We are going to have to try it out.

MRS. SAARINEN: Don't you run the danger with all this business -- might you not set up a state of total confusion and chaos when you have this kind of plan? And then you have this kind of changing five-seven thing, and changing relationships; and, when you got into it, would it not destroy? In other words, would a man-made object make itself enough felt vis-a-vis natural things?

MR. NETSCH: That's a temptation, Aline. If we could devise a building which you didn't know it was the building or the woods. This is why we are going to look at it all. If we could achieve that, it might be a kind of elegant way, rather than try to make such a positive big statement in the middle

because of -- well, really, this kind of meeting where
thing. I think, from the meeting, it is used to get a social
structural idea; whereas, I think in this environment that
can be very pleasant and very open.

MR. MITSCH: The vocational training there is an
field of trees about. We have about 2 feet of mulch all
a grid of nature on you have, on campus trees. And we have
that these will kind of watch it and the plants of the build-
ing will save of it...

MS. SHAFIEK: When you talk about collegiality
are you thinking of particular of something like that?

MR. MITSCH: It is in order. If I say, it's a pot
finally decided on. We are going to have to pay it out.

MS. SHAFIEK: Don't you run the danger of all
this business -- might you not get a sense of still some-
times and close when you have this kind of place? And then you
have this kind of creating city-wise entry, the classes,
relationships; and when you get into it, would lower the
in other words, could a one-size object more itself
fair vis-a-vis natural entropy.

MR. MITSCH: There's a commencement also. It
devise a building which you didn't have it was [illegible]
or the woods. This is why we are going to look at it. It
we could believe that, it might be a kind of change for
that try to make such a relative big difference in the whole

of the woods.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Aline, this is what we want in the Zoo. It really is.

MR. ROSZAK: I think it is a good idea; a marvelous idea.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Have the Zoo people looked at this? They won't understand a word.

MR. KELLY: There is a larger problem. Will you continue having an understandable circulation? A street system?

MR. NETSCH: We do develop the street system.

MR. KELLY: That street system has to be developed in all of the extensions, so you know where you stand.

MRS. SAARINEN: It is like labyrinths -- you have to decide yourself where you are going, and why.

MR. WARNECKE: You get your efficiency, and all that.

MR. NETSCH: We are running-- now, I have to shift horses here (the Government uses different systems of net gross). At colleges and universities of the new, unfortunately there is that 60-40 problem; and we are running around 62% on a laboratory building; and 68% on another laboratory building. And then, at MIT, where we are working in linear, we are lucky to make 50% with regular office laboratories. Here, using the university system, we are running about 60%. But that is not the Governmental way of

of the words.

CHAIRMAN WELTON: Filing suits is what we want to see Zao. Is reality in.

Ms. MORGAN: I think it is a good idea to introduce ideas.

CHAIRMAN WELTON: Have the Zao people broken or they won't understand a word.

MR. FRIED: There is a lengthy recess. All are cautious having an understandable misunderstanding a system?

MR. MUSIC: We do develop the proper vehicle.

MR. KELLY: Time after time, so you know where you stand.

MRS. HARTMAN: It is like lobbying -- you have to decide yourself where you are going, and do.

MR. HARRISON: You get your definition, don't you?

MR. MUSIC: We are running -- now, I have to call Lorena here (the Government uses different symbols of the army). We collapse and whatever of the Army Corps-nearly there is some 80-90 problems; and we are coming around 417 on a temporary building; and 58. We started laboratory building. And then, at MIT, there is one building in Ithaca, we are lucky to make 597 site logical decision laboratories. Here, using the university system, we are running about 60%. Now that is not the Government -- we

saying it. And, according to the Government number, that is a disaster. But they add other elements in, and I think it runs 80% in the manner in which it is recorded.

MR. KELLY: A scale structure and such things.

MR. NETSCH: That's the other reason we don't have elevations evolved -- we are not supposed to even.

We have an interesting problem. This scheme represents in square footage the size of MIT, when it opened in 1913, with, of course, all of the sophistication of 1967. So it is a wonderful problem. And those of you who have been involved with large urban universities or technological know that fire protection is a key issue. And all of the universities work out with the local Fire Department very complex systems of fire control. Well, we have a volunteer Fire Department, and that's hardly adequate. So we are reviewing with the Government, G. S. A., and a client -- Johnson Survey -- how far we should go in developing really in-house fire protection; that is, how much piping should we put in, and is it the appropriate method.

We know that we are going to have to do more than usual. So the question then comes: Do we go to a steel structure; or do we stay with concrete, and try to make it all-secure?

MR. KELLY: And, in the end, your beautiful free grid extension may have, as a limit, fire walls.

MR. NETSCH: They would be internal; they would not be external. Yes, I see what you mean. Yes, in defining areas.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki, any questions?

MR. WARNECKE: You don't end up with a lot of funny little triangles? You are able to work it in your present program, but you don't know, in the future, when you want to change the program.

MR. NETSCH: We developed some octagonal spaces as a joint, and a hammerhead, and we have found our way out of the triangle; but, occasionally, you do get an acute angle, but it doesn't happen very often. We have one building under construction using this.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This has been very fascinating, and we could go along with it forever. Alas, we have to go to another project. If there are no more questions, we thank you very much for a fascinating presentation.

MR. NETSCH: Thank you very much for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:55 o'clock p.m., Mr. Netsch departed.]

V. c. Connection Between Executive Office Building and the White House

MR. ATHERTON: [Indicating plan] You didn't get a chance to look at this this morning. I don't know whether you

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

At its meeting on the 21st of June the Commission of Fine Arts considered the schematic designs for the Geological Survey Headquarters Building at Reston, Virginia.

As you probably know, the architect has approached solution of this problem in a somewhat unusual manner which has resulted in a building form of great complexity. A fairly convincing case can be made if the validity of this type of systematic program analysis is accepted. On the other hand, one cannot help but wonder if the system is nearly conceived as an end in itself. Certainly the clients of this building should be aware of the complicated relationships developed in the internal organization of the building and the inherent difficulty that must be inevitable in finding ones way around. I know this is not the usual concern of this Commission, but it is such an integral part of the whole architectural solution, that one cannot separate internal function and architectural expression. However, if the using agency is satisfied this building will work internally, the Commission will forego any further criticism of the design pending a look at the architectural development of the scheme.

One positive asset of this project is, of course, that it is set in a large landscaped area which provides a great degree of freedom in expression.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C. 20405

EXHIBIT T 2

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
20 June 1967

AM
10:15

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Dates of Next Meeting:
Executive Session: 19 September 1967
Open Session: 20 September 1967

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building, Reston, Va.

c. National Zoological Park - Multi-Climate Building

d. National Institutes of Health, Multi-level Parking Facilities

e. F.B.I. Building - Revised Design

f. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building

2. Federal Reserve Board

New Federal Reserve Board Building, C Street between 20th and 21st Sts., N.W. - Revised Design

3. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

a. Dalecarlia Filter Plant, Rivers and Harbors Office Building, and Shelter over Test Basin - Proposed Design

b. NCO Open Mess, Ft. Myer - Proposed Design

c. Arlington National Cemetery, Administrative and Services Buildings - Review

d. Dalecarlia Filter Plant Entranceway - Review

4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains

b. Douglass Community Center Building, 20th Street north of Stanton Terrace, S.E.

c. Columbia Island Landscaping Development

d. Lincoln Park Reconstruction

5. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs

6. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg Tunnel

7. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

a. Dunbar High School - Revised Design

b. Congress Heights School - Proposed Design

c. Sanitation Department Garage, 13th & S Streets, N.W. - Proposed Design

d. Elementary School, Lincoln Road & Douglas Place, N.E. - Proposed Design

8. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

a. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

(2) Appendix 1

b. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Georgetown University Heating & Cooling Plant (O.G. 67-211)

(2) Appendix 2

9. D. C. Redevelopment Land Agency

10th Street S. W. Overlook Park - Revised Design

10. Pennsylvania Avenue Commission

Pennsylvania Avenue Tree Planting Plan

11. Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint

Medal Commemorating the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of San Antonio - Proposed Design

12. National Capital Planning Commission

Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital Region

13. American Battle Monuments Commission

Selection of architect for small monuments around the world.

IV. LEGISLATION

1. H.R. 9808-5/9/67-Mr. Eilberg-90th C

To authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of Saint Sebastian in the District of Columbia.

2. S.J. Res. 74-4/18/67-Mr.Randolph-90th C

To provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the United States Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

3. S.1582-4/19/67-Mr.Muskie-90th C

To foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal Public Buildings and Post Offices outside the District of Columbia,and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, to be known as the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act.

4. S.1590-4/20/67-Mr.Yarborough-90th C

To prohibit, without the express approval of Congress, any construction which would result in altering the proportions, changing the size, or modifying the United States Capitol Building in any substantial manner, and to establish a commission to study the existing and future space needs of the Congress.

V. INTERVIEWS

3:00 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Hirschhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden - Proposed Design

b. Geological Survey Headquarters Building, Reston, Va.-Proposed Design

c. Connection Between Executive Office Building and the White House

ADJOURN